1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
67	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
8	BRENDA JOHNSON,	CASE NO. C19-862RSM
9	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
10	v.	RECONSIDERATION
11	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF	
12	TRANSPORTATION, et al., Defendants.	
13	Defendants.	
14	This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion [for] Reconsideration. Dkt. #27	
15	Plaintiff requests that the Court reconsider its prior order, Dkt. #22, dismissing this action.	
16	"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored." LCR 7(h)(1). Consequently, the Court	
17	will "ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior	
18	ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the	
19	Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." <i>Id.</i> Plaintiff's Motion shows neither.	
20	Plaintiff appears to advance new arguments related to her 2014 state court and federal	
21	court cases. Dkt. #27 at 1–3. Plaintiff also appears to reargue her position on the claims the	
22	Court previously dismissed and attaches documents that appear to have little relevance to he	
23	claims. Id.; Dkt. #27-1. Plaintiff cites to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) (grounds for	
24	relief from a final judgment, order, or proceeding), but makes no effort to satisfy any of the	
	ORDER – 1	

grounds for relief under that Rule.

Plaintiff's Motion does nothing to demonstrate error in the Court's earlier order. Nor does Plaintiff's Motion advance any new legally valid arguments. Even if she did, Plaintiff makes no effort to explain why she could not have brought these arguments to the Court's "attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1).

Accordingly, and having considered Plaintiff's Motion and the record herein, the Court finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff's Motion [for] Reconsideration (Dkt. #27) is DENIED. This matter remains CLOSED.

Dated this 17 day of September, 2019.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE